

THE LIBERATOR.

VOL. VI.

OUR COUNTRY IS THE WORLD—OUR COUNTRYMEN ARE ALL MANKIND.

NO. 31.

BOSTON, MASSACHUSETTS.]

[SATURDAY, JULY 30, 1836.]

THE LIBERATOR

IS PUBLISHED WEEKLY, AT

NO. 46, WASHINGTON STREET, BY

ISAAC KNAPP.

WM. LLOYD GARRISON, EDITOR.

TERMS.

Two dollars per annum, always payable in advance. All letters and communications must be post paid. The rate is moderate, in order to shield us from the frequent importations of our enemies—Those, therefore, who wish their letters to be taken from the Post Office by us, will be careful to pay the postage.

As a advertisement making one square, or a space of equal length and breadth, will be inserted three times for one dollar.

COMMUNICATIONS.

BROTHER GARRISON:—In the Newport 'Republican' of July 6, I find the following encomiastic article upon yourself, which is there inserted as a commendation. Its courtesy, decency, and veracity, are so characteristic of the valiant Newport champion of the law—the courageous hero who is bold to slay his fellow-citizens where they cannot be heard in reply—that I am much inclined to award the praise of its authorship to the gallant Benjamin himself. I append a few notes, to point out some of its many blemishes.

WM. LLOYD GARRISON.

In the 'Liberator' of the 21st inst. we find a letter of William L. Garrison filled with abuse of the citizens of this town, and of the members of our General Assembly. As the tongue and pen of this person, to his grief, have long become non-conductors of calumny, as they always were of truth, we shall only tax ourselves with a brief summary of the proceedings he has labored to misrepresent.

Certain memorials of abolitionists, [1] to the General Assembly, at its session in May last, were referred to a committee, with instructions to 'hear such testimony as might be submitted to them by or in behalf of the petitioners.' There was no formal meeting of the committee; but it was agreed, by three of them, that Wednesday evening of the session week in June should be the time of meeting. Notice of this was given in the newspapers, by the Chairman; who added to the notice an unlimited and extraordinary invitation to the memorialists and all others interested, to appear, if they saw fit, and be heard. [2]

This sweeping license was neither authorized by the vote of the House, nor by the Committee, [3] and was wholly at variance with the duty of the Committee; who could without any embarrassment receive, at its first meeting, whatever testimony (of any) the petitioners might have to present, and would have ample time left to deliberate upon and make their report during the session. But the idea of a Legislative Committee, setting to hear the lectures and declamations of all comers from all quarters, upon the subject of slavery and abolition, was perfectly preposterous. If the invitation had been contrived by the agitators themselves, they could not have exulted in it more than they did, nor could it have better suited their purposes. The sinister use to which they meant to put it was soon apparent; and is now fully exposed by Garrison himself, his acknowledged leader and founder. [4]

In his fit of mortification at the loss of so fine an opportunity for exciting disturbances in this quiet town, he has exposed the design of himself and his coadjutors. No pains were spared, (he tells us) to bring together for the occasion, some of their ablest champions. [5] 'It was confidently expected (he continues) that Theodore D. Weld would be on the spot, but the recent mobs in Troy, where he had been lecturing, induced him to remain in that city, at great personal hazard, still fighting valiantly.' [6] 'Our eloquent brother Stanton was also expected here, and arrived at all points.' Brother (Rev. Esqr. Sam'l.) May would have been here promptly, but 'he &c. &c. &c.' Yesterday (Rev. Amos) Phelps and C. C. Burleigh, with an excellent reporter from New York, came to Newport ready for the conflict; and the afternoon our esteemed friend, David L. Child, came with me to complete the list of speakers, accompanied by many abolition friends. 'Victorious as we are, we regret that we are not able to open our battery of free discussion—but perhaps we shall yet succeed in discharging, at least, one forty-two pounder before we leave.'

'If so, we hope to make a breach in this strong hold of slavery—for Newport is the Charleston or New Orleans of New England.' How could the man speak plainer or more unambiguously?—The Committee of the Legislature was to be used as the means and pretence for holding conventions in the committee room, under the ordering of Garrison [6] and the many abolition friends he brought with him; and in which the foreign declaimers of whom he gives us a list, were, night after night, as long as the session lasted, to have full scope to open their batteries and discharge their forty-two pounders upon this strong hold of slavery:—to revile the people of the town as he does, excite their indignation, outrage their feelings, and, if possible, stir up something which they might claim for a riot; as brother Theodore D. Weld has so successfully done at Troy, that he was necessarily kept there, fighting valiantly to prevent his riot from subsiding, as it must if he had left there to lend his hand to similar work in Newport. [5] Even the redoubtable brother Weld could not, conveniently, cultivate a riot in Troy and another in Newport at the same time. He was obliged, therefore, reluctantly, to leave poor Newport to the charge of his Rev. brother Phelps, Garrison, &c. &c. The sin of the people of Newport (in the eyes of such men as these) is their unqualified repugnance and aversion to the company of demagogues and impostors. [7]

Such a man as Garrison, with all his impudent hypocrisy, would never be tolerated here; [8] he could not get even the boys to follow him, unless he pelted him with rotten eggs, [9] which perhaps he might induce them to do, if not warned that he would set it down for a riot in his account with his employers, and claim his reward for it as

mightily advancing the 'great cause.' No doubt these worthies from Boston and New York, with the many friends and abolitionists they brought with them, and their 'able reporter,' would have labored hard to make up for the regrettable absence of brother Weld, and the 'eloquent brother Stanton, armed at all points.' They would as usual have anathematized and excommunicated all church members and ministers of all denominations, who do not think as they pretend to think, and would have reviled and denounced the government and people of the slaveholding States, as they did before the Committee of the Massachusetts Legislature, and have incessantly done in all their speeches and lectures, almost without a single exception. [10] The eight persons set down in Garrison's 'list of speakers,' all except one, were or had been hired declaimers of the American Anti-Slavery Society, as appears by the reports of their 'Executive Committee.' [11] None of the Rhode Island memorialists were thought worthy of a place in this 'list of speakers.' But some of them, probably, would have been warmed up and inspired by the discharge of a forty-two pounder, and have made bold to ask leave to speak after their superiors. [12] There would have been no want of speakers to have held out bravely, if necessary, for a period longer than an entire Congressional session. Measuring their strength of lungs and capacity for long speaking, by the samples we have in the published speeches and lectures of those alone set down in Garrison's list of speakers, any one of them would have been more than competent to have taken up the remaining part of the week in which the committee were to act. And the same scene would have been acted over at the next weekly session, and the next, without end. By the next session brother Weld would probably have made all he could of his Troy riot; and the eloquent brother Stanton, 'armed at all points,' would have been ready to assist in opening the batteries. Once permitted to enter upon this career, they would have had the committee wholly in their possession, and would have gone on as they pleased; for the moment the committee had endeavored to bring them to any regular course of proceeding, or interfered with them in the slightest manner, they would have raised the usual outcry that they were gagged, and denied a hearing, and deprived of the privilege of 'free discussion.' And this they meant should be the termination of the business before the committee, and in the General Assembly also. This is exactly the same course which the same men and their coadjutors pursued before the committee of the Massachusetts Legislature; and which is unequivocally indicated in Garrison's letter now before us. [13]

Such were to have been the fruits of the unwarranted invitation inserted in the newspapers. The majority of the committee were determined not to be so imposed upon and insulted; nor to permit the House which had appointed them to be, through them, so abused. It was evident that they could not, with any propriety, meet under such a notice as had been given. They therefore recommended to the House, as the most correct course, to continue the committee, with directions to report at the next session, granting leave, in the mean time, to the memorialists, (not intruding strangers) to present to the committee in writing, whatever documents, evidence, arguments or remarks, they or any of them might have to offer. And who with any shadow of right, or reason, or sincerity, could complain of the liberty thus proffered? It was evident from the preparations made, and the number of speakers collected, that it was not intended that the committee should have any chance of reporting at the then session at least, and this was intimated without disguise; if, then, the memorialists, or more properly speaking, the hired foreign agents into whose hands they had surrendered themselves, if these master agents, in the name of their wards and pupils, really thought themselves gifted with any new and bright ideas, more than had been repeated a thousand times in their quarterly, monthly, weekly and daily publications; did not the course proposed, give them the best opportunity of making the most of their arguments, by carefully digesting, maturing and arranging them, and addressing them to the understanding in a substantial form, in which their intrinsic weight and merits might best be examined and understood? But no; it was far from their intention to expose themselves to such a test. The privilege of reasoning coolly, and having their reasons coolly examined, was not their wish; they desired only the license of ranting and railing; or, the alternative, of amoring about arbitrary proceedings, and the denial of rights. [13]

The bill before the House, of which the memorialists complained, if adopted, would have been a general public law, in the discussion of which in the General Assembly, no set of individuals, had any more right to claim to be heard, than in the discussion of any other public act. [14] The bill, in substance, provided that all overt acts and practices calculated and designed to excite the slaves, in the slaveholding States, against their masters, encouraging them to insurrection, and thereby endangering the property, safety, and lives of the people of those States, should be deemed to be criminal offences and punished, &c. There was not a syllable in the bill that could be construed as interfering, in the remotest degree, with the freedom of discussion or of the press. Not a word that could be honestly complained of, by any good citizen who neither meant himself to commit the crime intended to be punished, nor was willing that others should be left at liberty to commit it. It would have been well if our memorialists, before allowing themselves to be so made use of by these hired agents and lecturers from other States, had reflected upon the very unfavorable inference to which their complaining of a bill simply providing for the just punishment of a most flagrant crime, must unavoidably render them liable. [15] But they were fellow-citizens, and were treated with indulgence, [16] although they had no manner of right to claim to be heard, (except by their memorials) upon such an occasion. What then shall we say of the matchless impudence of a set of hired foreign agents and emissaries in the pay of a foreign association, who have attempted to interfere in our legislation, have dared to demand a hearing before a committee of our Legislature, in objection to a public

law pending before that Legislature, and are now outrageously abusing and denouncing that Committee and Legislature, and the citizens of one of our principal towns, because their demands were not complied with? This is the manner in which the American Anti-Slavery Society addresses itself 'to the understanding and consciences of the people.' [17] What would have been the style of their oratory, had these declaimers succeeded in forcing themselves upon us, in defiance of the wishes of the great bulk of the people of the town, some slight idea may be formed from the following short specimen in a speech of similar character throughout, delivered before a company of young men in New York, by the eloquent brother Stanton, and published in the Society's 'Human Rights,' Aug. 8th, 1835. 'Oh, but immediate emancipation would be unsafe—the slave would butcher his master, and fill the land with rapine and murder.' 'Suppose,' said Mr. Stanton, 'the intelligence should reach this city to-day, that the slaves had risen in insurrection, and were scattering dismay and death through the South. Would not the veriest child know the cause?—"They are fighting for their freedom," would be the universal cry.'

And let us see what was to be expected from the Rev. Amos Phelps, who, no doubt, would have expatiated upon his favorite scheme of amalgamating the white and black races, by marrying white women to black men, as the only sure means of begetting 'perfect equality,' and leveling all distinctions. In his 'Lectures on Slavery and its remedy,' (pp. 235, 6, 7, 8,) he says:—'When I hear it, I hardly know whether to most to pity the ignorance or to frown with indignation at the folly it betrays, it is the offspring of a most cruel and wicked prejudice. It merits only pity or contempt, and by and by, this prejudice should melt away, and the generation then on the stage should have no objection to amalgamation, who should you be concerned? If they (your children—sons and daughters) choose it, why should you forbid them?' He then reinforces himself by a quotation from a female advocate for negro husbands, as follows, viz. 'Let the sons and daughters of Africa both be educated, and then they will be fit for each other. They (the negro men) will not be found to make war upon their white neighbors for wives; nor will they, if they have intelligent women of their own, see any thing so very desirable as the project.'

We do not know whether Amos Phelps himself claims to be a white man or a negro, or in the offspring of his sweet amalgamation. From the baseness of his appetites, (we will not call them sentiments) he might be taken for a genuine anglo of the highest pedigree.

Such are the 'moral influences' by which the Society is going to effect immediate emancipation, such the agents it employs; and such the proofs of its aversion to all 'caral warfare.' These two agents explain the whole system and plan of operations. One of them threatens insurrection, dismay, and death to the people of the South, while the other invites to the propagation of an entire new race of people. [18]

The 'excellent reporter' whom they brought with them from New-York, was the same who so scandalously caricatured, garbled, and distorted the proceedings and speeches he pretended to report, that even the three or four members who had spoken in favor of his employers most loudly, exclaimed against his incompetence or villany.

Since we have condescended to notice this man, Garrison, at all, we ought not to pass over his conduct, and that of some of his companions while in this town. They quartered themselves at a public house, at which the Lieut. Gov. and a number of the members of the General Assembly had previously taken lodgings; [19] and during their whole stay here, they were continually assailing the members with the most insolent language and grossest personal abuse, to their faces—calling them cowards and dough-faces, and telling them that they had seen better men than they bought. Garrison took the lead in this insolence, and one day at a crowded dinner table called out aloud, 'we have got a list of the dough-faced members, and they shall be taken care of next August.' [20] (the time of our semi-annual elections.) Yet, after all this, we can inform Wm. L. Garrison, that if he should venture to come into this town again, he will not be thought of consequence enough to get himself tarred and feathered; although no man of so little consequence more richly deserves it. Whenever he very much wants to be mobbed again, he must go to some other place, where he is not too much despised to be able to produce excitement. [21]

1. Asking to be heard by counsel, in reply to the false accusations of Benj. Hazard, Esq., and his fellow-slenderers.

2. Is it then so 'extraordinary,' that 'all persons interested' in a subject of proposed legislation, affecting reputation and inalienable rights, should be invited 'to appear and be heard in the premises?' No marvel indeed, that it seems so to a gentleman whose courage is just about upon a par with his respect for the ninth commandment, and who, with sagacity enough to perceive that stabbing in the back is somewhat safer than striking at the face—that abusing the absent is more prudent and discreet, than permitting the calumniated to be present and defend themselves, is quite willing to remain under the shelter of legislative privilege, while he basely assails those whom he dare not encounter.

3. Hazard made the same assertion before the Legislature, but it was promptly repelled by the chairman of the committee, and I think by another gentleman, if not by more. Be that as it may, the attempt to represent the notice of the chairman as unauthorized by the vote of the House, is well worthy of the quibbling genius of one who has so long been accustomed to grope in dark and crooked paths, that he is blinded and lost in a straight road on which the sun shines. Men who are expert in framing their own discourse so that they construe it in any way, can no doubt find meaning in another's sentences, which the author never dreamed of, while they can overlook what to ordinary readers, would seem the most obvious interpretation. Your readers have seen the vote

of the Legislature, instructing the Committee 'to hear such testimony as may be submitted to them, by or in behalf of the petitioners'—clearly implying that the petitioners were expected to employ others to speak in their behalf, if such should be their pleasure. What could be more rational than such a construction of a vote, referring a petition to be heard by counsel?

4. The intelligence of your 'mortification' will be news to you, I presume, brother Garrison, as well as to your readers, who had till now supposed your letter to have been written in the joy of victory, rather than under the mortification of defeat. But alas!—they had not the keen penetration of the Newport scribe. And then your confession! Verily the cause must have been powerful, which could have produced such a direful disclosure! How could you—even mortified as you were because 'the enemy precipitately fled'—how could you be so unguarded. Since some of your readers may have forgotten the horrible purport of this same confession, and the wickedly 'sinister use' which 'the agitators' were to have made of Mr. Dorr's unauthorized and 'sweeping license,' I will quote your very words in all their hideous enormity. 'The R. I. State Anti-Slavery Society immediately appreciated the importance of having our principles and measures ably vindicated in this pro-slavery town, under these circumstances, and it accordingly spared no pains to bring forward on this occasion, some of our ablest advocates.' The naughty 'agitators' who compose the R. I. Anti-Slavery Society! What right had they to appropriate anything, but the sovereign will and pleasure of Squire Benjamin Hazard, Esq., the great man of Newport? What right had they to entertain the 'sinister' design of refuting before a Newport audience, the slanders which had been heaped upon them—and of proving 'Squire Hazard a vile calumniator, before his own fellow townsmen? Above all, what right had they—a part of the people of Rhode Island, to think of going into their own State House, and before a committee of their own public servants, to defend in a pro-slavery town, the principles of liberty; to maintain peacefully, the antiquated doctrines of that old arch schismatic, Roger Williams; to breach the heresies in regard to human rights, which such rank 'agitators' as Thomas Jefferson, and Patrick Henry, and Stephen Hopkins, and their rebellious associates used to preach, and such bloody insurrectionists as George Washington, and Joseph Warren, and Nathaniel Greene used to vindicate with sword and bayonet? Unheard of audacity! Down upon your marrow bones, ye low mechanicals—ye vulgar, dirty, sweaty, hard-handed farmers—ye labor-soiled manufacturers—ye of the vile commonality of every name and degree, who have presumed to belong to the State Anti-Slavery Society—nay, have dared to make an effort to bring forward some of the ablest advocates of your heretical doctrine—down upon your marrow bones, and humbly beg pardon of your lords paramount in Newport, more especially of the little great man who has condescended, in his benevolence, to try to reclaim you from the error of your ways, by the mild persuasions of legal guile and penalties.

5. 'For truth and liberty,' says your letter. A sufficient cause for the Newport gentleman's grief, and no doubt in his eyes, reason enough why the Troy riot should not 'subside.' To do 'similar work in Newport,' would doubtless be thought equally ample justification of the same results there, and from a pretty plain hint thrown out by one of the Newport representatives in the House, it is highly probable 'no pains' would have been 'spared' by certain dear friends of 'our southern brethren,' to produce a like result.

6. A precious compliment to the Committee.—Could not Messrs. Dorr and Hazard and their associates, 'order' their own proceedings?

7. Witness their keeping Hazard in the Legislature year after year. Witness their admitting Kneeland into the Court House, to preach infidelity and atheism on the Sabbath, and call it reason, truth, virtue, philosophy.

8. 'The servant is not above his lord. If they have called the master of the house Beelzebub, how much more shall they call them of his household?' If the scribes and Pharisees of old, would not tolerate in Jerusalem, Him who came 'to proclaim liberty to the captives, and to bind up the broken hearted,' what wonder that Newport—slave-trading Newport, as long as the law would let her be, and still pro-slavery Newport, 'the New Orleans of New England'—should not tolerate one who is in some humble degree endeavoring to imitate his Master's benevolent example? Who expects that they who, (for reasons which the readers of the New Testament can guess) 'love darkness rather than light,' will tolerate a man who is continually pouring in the light of truth upon them?

9. Very likely—for the proverb tells us, 'as the old cock crows,' &c.

10. All this falsehood and slang is but another copy of the stereotype edition, which our opponents keep 'constantly on hand,' as the advertisements have it.

11. As this assertion contains nothing material, proper, or even, I can only attribute it to the mere love or fixed habit of lying.

12. The Rhode Island memorialists doubtless thought they had a right to invite what speakers they pleased, or to speak themselves if they pleased, and hence the oversight they committed, in not submitting their 'list of speakers' to 'Squire Hazard's revision, and asking his leave to employ as counsel the persons therein named.

13. For an answer to all the sophistry and misrepresentation contained in these two long paragraphs, I refer your readers to the address to the people of R. I. by the Abolitionists who assembled in Newport, and the Executive Committee of the State Society.—They have read it in your 27th No.

14. The writer probably knows better. He knows that the bill and resolutions were intended for the abolitionists, though couched in language that did not truly describe, or seem to refer to them. Every member of the House understood that such was the case. The whole history of their origin and progress clearly proves it, and if this writer does not know it, he is more completely brainless than I had even supposed him.

15. I am aware that Hazard has repeatedly declared, that in his tirades against the abolitionists, he referred only to those of other States, but not at all to those of Rhode Island. Oh no! the Rhode Island abolitionists are good, honest, well-meaning men—great simpletons to be sure, but quite harmless and well disposed. Such is the necessary inference from his language, for he represents them as with the most innocent intentions, giving their aid and countenance to treason, insurrection and murder, and all the horrid crimes that follow in the train of civil and servile war. 'The Providence Society is as innocent as a lamb,' but the American Society, to which the Providence Society 'declared itself auxiliary,' and by which it is 'owned as such,' circulates 'reports and papers' that 'make the hair stand on end,' and that 'go to subvert the Union.' The R. I. abolitionists receive, pay for, read and circulate these terrible publications, but they 'don't intend to do any thing wrong'—nay, 'some of them,' Hazard tells us, (which, if true, is certainly the worst thing I know of them—and bad enough too,) are his 'personal friends.' Verily, by his account, to escape calling them villains and knaves, he makes them appear wonderfully like fools. As if they can't ascertain the character of the books and papers they read, and the principles those publications avow, as well as 'the gentleman from Newport!' But who credits his fair speeches, and nice distinctions? Or granting that the slander and abuse was all aimed at men in other States, was the law too, designed to operate on New Yorkers and Bostonians? Is Ben Hazard such a simpleton as to be enacting it a penal offence for citizens of New York to interfere with the affairs of Virginia? No! The bill was designed to operate, (and it became a law) on abolitionists;—the R. I. abolitionists; and the 'flagitious crime' it was intended to punish, was, as its advocates and its opposers both well know, the free discussion of American slavery. It is contemptible quibbling, (to give it no harder name,) to say it is no interference with freedom of discussion or of the press, for, (unless it had remained a dead letter on the pages of the statute book,) it would have been used to abridge that freedom. R. I. has laws enough already, to guard against and correct any criminal abuse of freedom of speech or of the press, and for that purpose no more legislation is required. This proposed law, therefore, is either superfluous or mischievous. This the freemen of Rhode Island know, and when at length Hazard perceived that they knew it, he dared not attempt to push his bill through, but 'backed out' with as good a grace as he could.

16. Really! the Rhode Islanders have great cause to be thankful that they have such 'gracious' sovereigns, who 'indulge' them with permission to go to Newport, under a promise that they shall be heard in self-defence where they have been calumniated. As to the door being slammed in their face after they had got there, and before they were allowed to say a word,—why, that affords no ground of complaint, for 'they had no manner of right' to come there at all on such an errand. The invitation was a mere 'indulgence.'

17. Merely another copy of the stereotype.

18. Here again the writer must have known that he was penning an absolute falsehood, and that if he had quoted entire, the passages which he has garbled to make his assertion seem true, his falsehood would have appeared manifest as day light. Even as it is, the mutilated extracts by no means sustain his accusation, but, unmangled, they would have branded 'liar' on his very forehead. First, for the quotation from brother Stanton, who is charged with threatening insurrection, &c. In the speech from which it is taken, he combats the common objections to abolitionism and among the rest, in reply to the cry of danger, he contends that emancipation would be safe. He says,

'Oh, but immediate emancipation would be unsafe—the slave would butcher his master, and fill the land with rapine and murder.'

Suppose, said Mr. S., the intelligence should reach this city to-day, that the slaves had risen in insurrection, and were scattering dismay and death through the South. Would not the veriest child know the cause? 'They are fighting for their freedom,' would be the universal cry. Give the slave his freedom, then, and will he fight because you give it to him? First, he fights because he is robbed of liberty, and when it is restored, he fights because he's got it!—God must repeal the fundamental laws of human nature, dry up the springs of human conduct, before men will act on such principles.'

So far from threatening insurrection, he shows that the measures we propose, would prevent insurrection. The man who will represent this as a threat, must be either consummately stupid, or utterly reckless of truth.

Brother Phelps is as grossly misrepresented as Stanton. The writer knows, if he has sense enough to understand plain English, that in the pages from which he quotes, Phelps is not 'combating the objections against amalgamation,' but is answering the absurd objection often urged against emancipation, that it will cause amalgamation. Against this he contends, as the writer knows, that emancipation will have the very opposite tendency. 'When I hear it,' he says, 'I hardly know whether most to pity the ignorance, or to frown with indignation at the prejudice it betrays. If ever I feel disposed to "answer a fool according to his folly," it is at such a time. However, I generally contrive to be serious, and show the panic-stricken objector, that, after all, there is no lion there.' And after presenting some arguments against the objection, and giving a quotation from Mrs. Child's Appeal, he adds, 'A way then with this hue and cry about amalgamation. It is entirely groundless—the offspring of a most cruel and wicked prejudice.' The 'quotations

of the Legislature, instructing the Committee 'to hear such testimony as may be submitted to them, by or in behalf of the petitioners'—clearly implying that the petitioners were expected to employ others to speak in their behalf, if such should be their pleasure. What could be more rational than such a construction of a vote, referring a petition to be heard by counsel?

4. The intelligence of your 'mortification' will be news to you, I presume, brother Garrison, as well as to your readers, who had till now supposed your letter to have been written in the joy of victory, rather than under the mortification of defeat. But alas!—they had not the keen penetration of the Newport scribe. And then your confession! Verily the cause must have been powerful, which could have produced such a direful disclosure! How could you—even mortified as you were because 'the enemy precipitately fled'—how could you be so unguarded. Since some of your readers may have forgotten the horrible purport of this same confession, and the wickedly 'sinister use' which 'the agitators' were to have made of Mr. Dorr's unauthorized and 'sweeping license,' I will quote your very words in all their hideous enormity. 'The R. I. State Anti-Slavery Society immediately appreciated the importance of having our principles and measures ably vindicated in this pro-slavery town, under these circumstances, and it accordingly spared no pains to bring forward on this occasion, some of our ablest advocates.' The naughty 'agitators' who compose the R. I. Anti-Slavery Society! What right had they to appropriate anything, but the sovereign will and pleasure of Squire Benjamin Hazard, Esq., the great man of Newport? What right had they to entertain the 'sinister' design of refuting before a Newport audience, the slanders which had been heaped upon them—and of proving 'Squire Hazard a vile calumniator, before his own fellow townsmen? Above all, what right had they—a part of the people of Rhode Island, to think of going into their own State House, and before a committee of their own public servants, to defend in a pro-slavery town, the principles of liberty; to maintain peacefully, the antiquated doctrines of that old arch schismatic, Roger Williams; to breach the heresies in regard to human rights, which such rank 'agitators' as Thomas Jefferson, and Patrick Henry, and Stephen Hopkins, and their rebellious associates used to preach, and such bloody insurrectionists as George Washington, and Joseph Warren, and Nathaniel Greene used to vindicate with sword and bayonet? Unheard of audacity! Down upon your marrow bones, ye low mechanicals—ye vulgar, dirty, sweaty, hard-handed farmers—ye labor-soiled manufacturers—ye of the vile commonality of every name and degree, who have presumed to belong to the State Anti-Slavery Society—nay, have dared to make an effort to bring forward some of the ablest advocates of your heretical doctrine—down upon your marrow bones, and humbly beg pardon of your lords paramount in Newport, more especially of the little great man who has condescended, in his benevolence, to try to reclaim you from the error of your ways, by the mild persuasions of legal guile and penalties.

5. 'For truth and liberty,' says your letter. A sufficient cause for the Newport gentleman's grief, and no doubt in his eyes, reason enough why the Troy riot should not 'subside.' To do 'similar work in Newport,' would doubtless be thought equally ample justification of the same results there, and from a pretty plain hint thrown out by one of the Newport representatives in the House, it is highly probable 'no pains' would have been 'spared' by certain dear friends of 'our southern brethren,' to produce a like result.

6. A precious compliment to the Committee.—Could not Messrs. Dorr and Hazard and their associates, 'order' their own proceedings?

7. Witness their keeping Hazard in the Legislature year after year. Witness their admitting Kneeland into the Court House, to preach infidelity and atheism on the Sabbath, and call it reason, truth, virtue, philosophy.

8. 'The servant is not above his lord. If they have called the master of the house Beelzebub, how much more shall they call them of his household?' If the scribes and Pharisees of old, would not tolerate in Jerusalem, Him who came 'to proclaim liberty to the captives, and to bind up the broken hearted,' what wonder that Newport—slave-trading Newport, as long as the law would let her be, and still pro-slavery Newport, 'the New Orleans of New England'—should not tolerate one who is in some humble degree endeavoring to imitate his Master's benevolent example? Who expects that they who, (for reasons which the readers of the New Testament can guess) 'love darkness rather than light,' will tolerate a man who is continually pouring in the light of truth upon them?

9. Very likely—for the proverb tells us, 'as the old cock crows,' &c.

10. All this falsehood and slang is but another copy of the stereotype edition, which our opponents keep 'constantly on hand,' as the advertisements have it.

11. As this assertion contains nothing material, proper, or even, I can only attribute it to the mere love or fixed habit of lying.

12. The Rhode Island memorialists doubtless thought they had a right to invite what speakers they pleased, or to speak themselves if they pleased, and hence the oversight they committed, in not submitting their 'list of speakers' to 'Squire Hazard's revision, and asking his leave to employ as counsel the persons therein named.

13. For an answer to all the sophistry and misrepresentation contained in these two long paragraphs, I refer your readers to the address to the people of R. I. by the Abolitionists who assembled in Newport, and the Executive Committee of the State Society.—They have read it in your 27th No.

14. The writer probably knows better. He knows that the bill and resolutions were intended for the abolitionists, though couched in language that did not truly describe, or seem to refer to them. Every member of the House understood that such was the case. The whole history of their origin and progress clearly proves it, and if this writer does not know it, he is more completely brainless than I had even supposed him.

15. I am aware that Hazard has repeatedly declared, that in his tirades against the abolitionists, he referred only to those of other States, but not at all to those of Rhode Island. Oh no! the Rhode Island abolitionists are good, honest, well-meaning men—great simpletons to be sure, but quite harmless and well disposed. Such is the necessary inference from his language, for he represents them as with the most innocent intentions, giving their aid and countenance to treason, insurrection and murder, and all the horrid crimes that follow in the train of civil and servile war. 'The Providence Society is as innocent as a lamb,' but the American Society, to which the Providence Society 'declared itself auxiliary,' and by which it is 'owned as such,' circulates 'reports and papers' that 'make the hair stand on end,' and that 'go to subvert the Union.' The R. I. abolitionists receive, pay for, read and circulate these terrible publications, but they 'don't intend to do any thing wrong'—nay, 'some of them,' Hazard tells us, (which, if true, is certainly the worst thing I know of them—and bad enough too,) are his 'personal friends.' Verily, by his account, to escape calling them villains and knaves, he makes them appear wonderfully like fools. As if they can't ascertain the character of the books and papers they read, and the principles those publications avow, as well as 'the gentleman from Newport!' But who credits his fair speeches, and nice distinctions? Or granting that the slander and abuse was all aimed at men in other States, was the law too, designed to operate on New Yorkers and Bostonians? Is Ben Hazard such a simpleton as to be enacting it a penal offence for citizens of New York to interfere with the affairs of Virginia? No! The bill was designed to operate, (and it became a law) on abolitionists;—the R. I. abolitionists; and the 'flagitious crime' it was intended to punish, was, as its advocates and its opposers both well know, the free discussion of American slavery. It is contemptible quibbling, (to give it no harder name,) to say it is no interference with freedom of discussion or of the press, for, (unless it had remained a dead letter on the pages of the statute book,) it would have been used to abridge that freedom. R. I. has laws enough already, to guard against and correct any criminal abuse of freedom of speech or of the press, and for that purpose no more legislation is required. This proposed law, therefore, is either superfluous or mischievous. This the freemen of Rhode Island know, and when at length Hazard perceived that they knew it, he dared not attempt to push his bill through, but 'backed out' with as good a grace as he could.

16. Really! the Rhode Islanders have great cause to be thankful that they have such 'gracious' sovereigns, who 'indulge' them with permission to go to Newport, under a promise that they shall be heard in self-defence where they have been calumniated. As to the door being slammed in their face after they had got there, and before they were allowed to say a word,—why, that affords no ground of complaint, for 'they had no manner of right' to come there at all on such an errand. The invitation was a mere 'indulgence.'

17. Merely another copy of the stereotype.

18. Here again the writer must have known that he was penning an absolute falsehood, and that if he had quoted entire, the passages which he has garbled to make his assertion seem true, his falsehood would have appeared manifest as day light. Even as it is, the mutilated extracts by no means sustain his accusation, but, unmangled, they would have branded 'liar' on his very forehead. First, for the quotation from brother Stanton, who is charged with threatening insurrection, &c. In the speech from which it is taken, he combats the common objections to abolitionism and among the rest, in reply to the cry of danger, he contends that emancipation would be safe. He says,

'Oh, but immediate emancipation would be unsafe—the slave would butcher his master, and fill the land with rapine and murder.'

Suppose, said Mr. S., the intelligence should reach this city to-day, that the slaves had risen in insurrection, and were scattering dismay and death through the South. Would not the veriest child know the cause? 'They are fighting for their freedom,' would be the universal cry. Give the slave his freedom, then, and will he fight because you give it to him? First, he fights because he is robbed of liberty, and when it is restored, he fights because he's got it!—God must repeal the fundamental laws of human nature, dry up the springs of human conduct, before men will act on such principles.'

So far from threatening insurrection, he shows that the measures we propose, would prevent insurrection. The man who will represent this as a threat, must be either consummately stupid, or utterly reckless of truth.

Brother Phelps is as grossly misrepresented as Stanton. The writer knows, if he has sense enough to understand plain English, that in the pages from which he quotes, Phelps is not 'combating the objections against amalgamation,' but is answering the absurd objection often urged against emancipation, that it will cause amalgamation. Against this he contends, as the writer knows, that emancipation will have the very opposite tendency. 'When I hear it,' he says, 'I hardly know whether most to pity the ignorance, or to frown with indignation at the prejudice it betrays. If ever I feel disposed to "answer a fool according to his folly," it is at such a time. However, I generally contrive to be serious, and show the panic-stricken objector, that, after all, there is no lion there.' And after presenting some arguments against the objection, and giving a quotation from Mrs. Child's Appeal, he adds, 'A way then with this hue and cry about amalgamation. It is entirely groundless—the offspring of a most cruel and wicked prejudice.' The 'quotations

from a female advocate for liberty and justice, with which 'he reinforces himself,' is to the same purport as appears even in the extract from it, which our writer gives. This writer in fact, while he betrays his dishonesty of purpose by garbling his quotations, has not in all cases wit enough to take only such portions as would seem to sustain his assertions, but convicts himself of misrepresentation by his own selections. The sons and daughters of Africa will be fit for each other, says Mrs. C. 'They will not see any thing so very desirable in the project' of having white wives. A singular way that, to advocate amalgamation! I will add here, just a few words in regard to the manner in which our writer quotes from Phelps' Lectures. He has referred to four pages, for what he gives in less than twenty lines. The beginning of his extract is on the 235th page. The second sentence, of a line and a half, is part of a sentence on the 237th page, and the third, of about a line, is from the same. The next two, are the commencement and close of a paragraph on the 236th. Thus by mutilating and transposition, he contrives to make out, what he considers, an invitation 'to the propagation of an entire new race of people.'

19. Unparalleled assurance! Presumed to take lodgings in the same 'public house' with the Lieut. Governor, and 'sundry members of the Assembly'! Who would have believed the 'fanatics' capable of such astonishing effrontery? And, I dare say, never asked any body's permission to go there, except that of the keeper of the 'public house'! Truly and indeed! Why had not mine host, or hostess—as the case might have been—more regard to the dignity of those illustrious characters, than to admit a company of mere commoners—and they the advocates of republican equality too—into such 'worshipful society'? And doubtless all sat at the same table! though, as that is not directly asserted, I can only infer it from the mention that you 'took the lead in this insolence, and one day, at a crowded dinner table, called out aloud,' &c. Oh! you 'untaught knave, unmanly!' It seems you had not even the grace to be silent, or to speak in whispers, while in the presence of those august personages, 'the Lieut. Governor, and members of the Assembly'! The world has come to a strange pass indeed! if such levelling practices can be tolerated. Why! there is reason to fear that soon a 'member of the Assembly' will be no more thought of, than one of the people, nay, the insolence of the people may rise to such a pitch, that they will give 'gentlemen of the House' an election to stay at home, without so much as saying, 'by your leave, Sirs.'

20. Whether you used any of these epithets, I do not know, but it is very true that some of the justly indignant citizens of R. I., who knew their own rights, and what belongs to the character of freemen, did apply them to certain of those who, not by their voice alone, but by the manner in which they attempted to justify it, proved their full right to the title, or to some other equally honorable.

21. Bless us! how magnanimous! how dignified! It is perfectly evident that your visit to Newport has produced no excitement in the mind of our worthy scribe—not at all, by no manner of means. He is as cool and quiet as a parched pea in a frying pan, if he may be allowed the homely old simile. Possibly, brother Garrison, if you were not so contemptible, and the companions of your excursion were not such despicable fellows, Ben Hazard or some of his trusty friends would have filled up three columns of the R. I. Republican, with an article headed by your name, and commenting on your doings and sayings, and those of your associates—and had you not been 'too much despised to be able to produce an excitement,' perhaps that article would have been well seasoned with gall and bitterness, falsehood, and personal abuse, and other indications of excited feelings in the author.

CHRISTIANITY AND SLAVERY.

MR. EDITOR.—The times in which we live are strongly marked, and constantly changing. Only a very few years ago, and ours was a most 'religious age'; to hear christians talk of it, one would think that very soon the Gospel would be published in every land, and every nation yield itself to its influence. Now the aspect of the times has changed, and that feeling has in a great measure subsided. Now the millennium is coming, no one knows when. The church is too much assimilated to the world, both in her principles and conduct, to be successful in any undertaking. When any project is started, or any plan proposed for her to engage in, the first question asked is, 'How will it take?' How will people generally feel about it?—and the manner in which these questions are answered, decides the will of God, and our duty respecting the matter. That this spirit prevails, and manifestly so, cannot be denied, nor must this course be censured; oh no, by no means; it is the course which prudence dictates, the only course which will preserve peace and secure the good will of men; and their good will must be secured, before they will be prepared to be benefited by our efforts to do them good. That is, if certain individuals, or a whole community are pursuing a course which we believe to be decidedly wrong, and which they are bent on continuing, we must adopt no measures in our efforts to reform them, but such as shall meet with their entire approbation. Not so, in my view, have we learned of our Master. Did He, while on earth, seek to please those to whom he was sent, and was he anxious for their favorable regard? Did He adopt the principles for preserving peace, which are so tenaciously held and so strenuously defended at the present day? I think not. But it will be said, you must not go so far back as that; and although he advocated his doctrines fearlessly, and knowing that he would receive the taunts and scoffs of men, yet where did he advocate the immediate or remote abolition of the slavery which existed around him? Here is a question for abolitionists to answer—a question which stares them directly in the face, meets them at every turn, and continually opposes their progress—a question which they themselves must answer in the negative, still they do not follow that example which they say is ever to be imitated; still abolitionism does not cease from the land, and because its advocates are so stubborn, so set in their way, that they will not be persuaded to turn from it. I would just say, that the arguments with which they are most frequently met, appear in the shape of stones, brick-bats, and such like missiles, sometimes far and dangerous, with sundry other such punishments as Judge Lynch, in the suddenness of his decisions, sees fit to inflict upon the offenders. This is mild, gentlemanly usage; these are well digested, considerate rebukes, nothing headstrong, nothing fanciful in these—nothing to undermine our institutions, to subvert our laws, or to destroy our republican edifice, so that 'one stone shall not be left upon another.' Alarming as is the fact, still the facts are undeniable, that there is abroad in the land, a spirit, which, if unchecked, will utterly destroy every thing sacred and desirable—every thing which makes a happy, an individual, a prosperous people. A mere glance at things as they are, is sufficient to make manifest this truth, and a strict examination would fill the mind of the philanthropist and the christian with overwhelming emotions. The laws are nothing but the outcroppings of popular violence. Really, we seem to be almost forsaken of God, and we have reason to fear lest he suffer his anger to wax hot against us, and consume us. Still we may hope that, for the sake of his church, and for the sake of that portion of his people which he has here separated to himself, mercy may yet be in store for us.

If instead of mercy, judgments are to be executed upon us, alas! how sore will be those judgments! Slavery is a great and growing evil, and to exterminate it, we cannot labor too strenuously, nor pray too fervently. When will men reason on this subject, as they reason on all other subjects? Say to one whom you consider a candid, truth-seeking man, that his reasonings on this subject, are inconsistent with his reasonings on all other subjects, and the only answer you obtain is, that between this and any other subject, there is no analogy. He says, moreover, your measures entirely defeat the object you have in view. The Gospel is the remedy, and the only remedy which can be effectually applied. Slavery is inconsistent with the principles of the Gospel, and where these are deeply rooted, slavery must die away.

Let me say a word on the question asked above—Did Christ advocate Emancipation? In return, I would ask, Did he condemn gambling, races, theatres, balls, rum-drinking, and the like? In the sense in which I answer the first question in the negative I do the last. The truth lies here; Christ laid down great principles, and from these I infer that the practices last mentioned are wrong and sinful, and with much more confidence do I infer from these principles, that slavery is a sin. To the man who denies that there is any subject analogous to this, I would say, analogies to it may be found in all moral questions. It has its analogy in the temperance cause, and in the moral reform cause. With just as much consistency might it be said, that the Gospel is the remedy for intemperance as well as for slavery; for it is just as true that the principles of the Gospel are opposed to intemperance, as that they are inconsistent with slavery. I confess myself puzzled to know what the objector means by the Gospel, unless he mean the whole Gospel, except what relates to Slavery—for he holds that on this subject our mouths must be shut. Take the cause of temperance, which bears a strong analogy to the one under consideration, and I would ask, if the Gospel is preached any more faithfully now, than it was before the reformation commenced, if love to God and love to man was not as strenuously inculcated before, as it has been since this reformation; if faith in the Lord Jesus Christ was not considered as essential to salvation then, as now? Each of these questions I must answer in the affirmative. Still there was rum drinking and rum selling, and where was the difficulty? Why, solely here; 'the whole Gospel was not preached. When men began to see that the Gospel had some bearing on the subject, and when they began to preach the part of the Gospel, which before had been a dead letter, then immediately followed conviction and conversion—effects which the Gospel unproclaimed, had not produced. How shall they hear without a preacher? And how will men know and obey the truth, until they hear it; in short, until it be, as it were, forced upon their minds?

One word to those who would apply the Gospel as a remedy for Slavery. I agree with you in the assertion, but I would go a little further and say, hold up the Gospel before the slaveholder, as inconsistent with his conduct, as condemning it, not as you really do, as smothering it. How gloriously consistent! To this class, without doubt, Dr. Ely belongs.

NEW AND OLD PURITANS.

The Puritans, the Pilgrim Fathers, 'the best of Fathers,' left England and came over to the 'promised land,' not because they could not bear the doctrines of those they left, which agreed 'in substance' with their own, but because they could not enjoy liberty of conscience, but because they could not control other people's consciences—not for the gospel, but for the lighter matters of the abolished law, because they could not bear the 'desecration of the Sabbath,' written prayers, surplices, May days and May poles, mimic pies and green hogues at Christmas, or in fact, any body's fashions or modes of worship but their own. As Mrs. Hemans says, 'they sought a faith's pure shrine, not a pure faith's shrine,' and their faith was in the ceremonies of the law, at least as much as in the righteousness of Christ.

Like other Pharisees, who go off of their own accord, and separate, and make sects, they left better men behind them, and produced worse after them. Their children are true Pharisees' children, brought up by the 'strictest sect' in the 'strictest manner,' and have as usual, all the self-righteousness and self-glorification of their fathers, with all the immorality and corruption of the Gentiles, which their fathers tried to escape. They have all the pride, obstinacy, and hard-heartedness of the ancient Jews, with all the love of money of the modern ones.—The ancient Jews, when they were destroyed at the destruction of Jerusalem, fought with and killed each other all night, and with the Romans all the day time, six days in the week, but when the 'holy Sabbath' came, they refused to fight altogether, and left the walls of the city to resist as they might. The modern Jews, like the Pharisees of old, even now cry—'This man is not of God, because he keepeth not the Sabbath day.' But in vain do they worship God, keeping for doctrines the commandments of men. If four fathers thought the people of England and Holland were so wicked, and 'themselves so pious and so holy,' they ought to have remained as Christ commanded, 'as sheep in the midst of wolves,' in England with their brethren, to do all the good in their power to their brethren, as the free colored people in this country are determined to stay, bearing the burdens of their colored brethren.

The Puritans of this country have no further place to which to retreat, except perhaps to New Holland or the Oregon Territory, provided they can cast out the natives or occupants of said countries, or make a good bargain with them for a fair low price. If they wish to go to a better region of the globe, they must go 'back again' to their mother country which they left, which is now increasing in liberty and justice, while ours decreases in both, to the alarm of almost all honest men of all parties.

The modern Puritans build the sepulchres of the prophets, which their fathers killed, and say, 'if we had lived in the times of our fathers, we would not have hung the Quakers, or banished Roger Williams, as they did.' They cry 'Liberty of the Press, Freedom of Speech, Free Discussion, and Missionary Operations' to teach other nations, while they seek to tar and feather, and even kill those who 'are sent over here to teach us our duty,' and lead in a halter the native citizen who only uses the liberty which every one claims, to speak for two millions of slaves, cruelly enslaved and oppressed in this land—in this land, 'the last hope of the nations,' where our fathers solemnly called upon 'God so to help them,' as they sincerely declared, 'appealing to Him for the sincerity of their intentions.'—That all men were born FREE and EQUAL, and are endowed by their Creator with certain INALIENABLE rights, among which are life, LIBERTY, and the pursuit of happiness. Their posterity, by the long-suffering of God, have been yet permitted every year, on the fourth of July, to repeat this most dreadful PERJURY.

And while the Doctors of Divinity are not troubled at this, and cry 'peace when there is no peace,' and tell to 'keep still 300 years longer,' they are greatly troubled at the 'desecration of the Sabbath,' that remnant of that law which neither our fathers or ourselves were able to bear, which was abolished by Christ, and continually exploded by Paul in almost every epistle. There is every proof, if such proof were required, that the Christians of the first ages never kept the Sabbath, except when they were 'bewitched,' and made to 'fall from grace,' by those Judaizing teachers which troubled them, and which Paul even 'wished were cut off.' These same 'foolish Galatians' also kept circumcision, which was not spoken against by Paul with more plainness than the Sabbath, and all observance of days, and months, and times, and years. (See Doddridge's Expositor, Colossians ii. 16, in which Doddridge, like other candid commentators, acknowledges that the 'Sabbath' could possibly mean no other than the seventh day Sabbath.)

The Lord's day, the first day of the week, was kept as a matter of fashion and convenience, as a day of assembling and rejoicing, and binds us no more than the Episcopacies, or Presbyteries, or Congregations of the early Christians. It remained for the Puritans, who hated Christian liberty and Christian rejoicing, and wished every Christian to wear a countenance not like those who were living under the law, though that were shameful enough, but like those who were actually suffering the penalties of the law, it remained for them, I say, to introduce in their dark and gloomy times (dark and gloomy because they would not rejoice in the true light,) the Jewish Sabbath again, the remnant being only taken from the last day of the week, and patched on to the first, in supposed honor of HIM who had taken away the hand writing of the law, and nailed to his cross all its ordinances. And if you ask by what authority they lay on this heavy burden, which yet they continually evade themselves, and will scarcely touch with one of their fingers, they reply—Because it is found among the ten commandments. Why then are not all the Jewish ceremonies binding, since they are found in the law given by Moses with the Decalogue? Why is not a grain of barley a grain of wheat, because it is contained in the same measure with the wheat? Why was not Judas a true Apostle of Christ, since he was among the other Apostles of Christ, and was sent out with them?

Luther, who believed in the righteousness and justification which is by faith, gave his advice that every man who was commanded to keep the 'Holy Sabbath,' should immediately break it to pieces, to testify against it. Puritanism alone tries, and with what success we have all seen, to keep this day. If this is the SUREST AXIOM of American religion, I pray that it may soon be broken to pieces, and that by faith, the true savior of the soul, sure and steadfast, we may lay hold of that which is within the veil, even Christ. But the veil is still over the eyes of this generation, as it is over that of the Jews, whom they so much resemble and surpass. The man of sin still sits in the place of God; may he soon be destroyed by the brightness of the coming of the Lord Jesus.

May the true Christian Sabbath soon come, when we shall rest from the works of the law, enjoy the glorious liberty of the children of God, loving our neighbor as ourselves, and pleasing him to his education, by walking according to all the 'wholesome words of our Lord Jesus Christ, and the doctrine which is according to godliness.'

A FRIEND TO THE AMERICAN UNION.
Sunday, July 24, 1836.

By an esteemed minister of the Society of Friends.
—Ed. Lib.

TO THE PROFESSORS OF CHRISTIANITY.

Whose sentiments on Slavery are merely passive.

DEAR BROTHERS—The inspired Psalmist fitly remarks, in relation to the wicked, that he 'blateth himself in his own eyes, until his iniquity be hateful.'... he seetheth himself in a way that is not good... he abhorreth not evil.'—Psalm 36.

In reading this portion of Scripture, I was deeply impressed with its application to many, I fear, to many thousands of the professors of Christianity of the present day, and particularly as it regards the 'evil' of slavery, now existing among us. A striking characteristic of the wicked is, 'he abhorreth not evil.' Are ye prepared to stand in that connection with him? Slavery is almost universally acknowledged to be an evil of a very imposing character—Is it not, indeed, a dereliction of the Gospel of righteousness and peace? For 'whoever shall keep the whole law, and yet offend in one point, he is guilty of all.' And here is an offending point of great and glaring magnitude, that cannot be concealed, and where is your protested abhorrence of it? When is it proclaimed? When do you 'cry aloud' against it? Are we not quiescent? Have we not set ourselves 'in a way that is not good'? Are we not disposed to palliate—to compromise—to excuse—and 'to flatter ourselves in our own eyes'? Our 'iniquity' at the same time becoming more obvious, and more and more 'hateful' to all faithful christians, and tearfully repugnant to divine justice.

'Why will ye die, O house of Israel?' Why will ye sleep the sleep of death? Why will ye inhabit darkness—and lend your aid to the prince of the power of the air? Why will ye contribute to the subversion of the Gospel of love and divine order? Oh! that ye may be induced to 'arise—shine'—and come out of this indifference, this lukewarmness to one of the greatest evils now infesting and cursing the earth; and promptly manifest your just, your noble and christian abhorrence of it, showing efficiently on whose side you are. 'Defend the poor and fatherless, do justice to the afflicted and needy—rid them out of the hands of the wicked.' And the righteous Judge of quick and dead, in the great day of account, will mercifully declare, that, 'Inasmuch as ye have done it unto one of the least of these my brethren, ye have done it unto me.'

GEORGE THOMPSON.

At a Stated Meeting of the Board of Managers of the Philadelphia Anti-Slavery Society, held at Sandford Hall, 3rd mo. 25th, 1836.

Dr. Edwin P. Atlee, from a Committee appointed at a previous meeting to prepare resolutions expressive of our approbation of the labors of GEORGE THOMPSON while in this country, produced the following, which, on motion, were unanimously adopted, and directed to be signed by all the members of the Board and forwarded.

On motion, Resolved, That a copy of said resolutions be sent to the Editor of 'the Liberator' for insertion in his paper.

WM. A. GARRIGUES, Sec'y.

Whereas, this Society, in common with the multitude of kindred Associations throughout our country, participates more or less in reputation with all who are engaged in the benevolent and patriotic object of Universal Emancipation;—

And whereas, GEORGE THOMPSON, of England, recently visited our land, for the sole purpose of stirring up the pure mind in ourselves and our fellow citizens, to a deep and religious consideration of the 'guilt and infamy' of Slavery;—

And whereas, the advocates of oppression and their abettors, have given animated circulation to the grossest libels upon the character and objects of this unanswerable champion of our cause;—

And whereas, we associated with him in private, and listened frequently in public to his fervid, powerful and christian appeals to the people of these United States;—

Therefore, Resolved, That so far as our observation extended, his language and conduct were in all things consistent with the righteous obligations of duty to God and man.

Resolved, That we sincerely believe the several charges preferred against him while among us, had their origin in the wicked attempt to crush the spirit of Liberty and Justice, which has of late arisen—and which, if permitted to spread, would shade to the centre the Despotism, that pollutes our otherwise free institutions, and establish our beloved Country forever upon the immutable basis designed by our Fathers, and sustained by the religion of Christ.

Resolved, That we proffer him and his family our unfeigned sympathy for the unrelenting abuse they received at the hands of those of our countrymen, who either knew not, or cared not, what they did—and trust that in the spirit of Him 'who came to seek and to save them that were lost,' their prayer may be, 'Father, forgive them.'

WM. A. GARRIGUES,
JAMES MOTT,
JOSEPH M. TRUEMAN,
DANIEL NEAL,
DREW PARRISH,
HENRY GREW,
Managers.

COLORED TEMPERANCE CONVENTION.

Pursuant to a call of colored friends of temperance in this State, delegates from various parts of the State met in Convention at Middletown, on the 11th of May last.

The Convention being called to order, prayer was offered by Rev. J. C. Beman of Middletown. Henry Foster of Hartford was called to the chair, and Peter Osborn of New Haven appointed Secretary.

Several members addressed the meeting on topics relating to the Temperance Reform in general, and the objects of the present Convention in particular.

A State Society was formed, and the following Preamble and Constitution adopted:

PREAMBLE.

Believing that the use of intoxicating liquors, as a common beverage, is injurious and unnecessary; that the use of them and the traffic in them ought immediately to be abandoned; that intemperance is the fruitful source of poverty, ignorance and crime; and that, while it is continued, these evils will not be done away; and that, as a people, our interests, our prosperity, and our happiness call upon us to forsake this course, and shun the rock on which so many have split; Therefore, with an humble reliance on the blessing of Almighty God for aid in this reformation, we pledge ourselves to one another, and to the people whom we represent, that we will both by precept and example, do all we can to suppress this great evil, and do adopt the following

CONSTITUTION.

Article 1. This Society shall be called 'The Connecticut State Temperance Society of Colored People.'

Art. 2. The members of this Society shall consist of all the Presidents and Secretaries of local auxiliary societies, and delegates chosen annually to represent said societies.

Art. 3. The members of this Society promise to abstain from the use of all fermented liquors that produce intoxication, as well as all distilled spirits, and not use them as a common drink, nor traffic in them, neither furnish them for other persons than to use.

Art. 4. The officers of this Society shall consist of a President and as many Vice Presidents as there shall be local auxiliary societies—the Presidents of such societies to be Vice Presidents of the State Society; and a Recording and Corresponding Secretary, a Treasurer and an Executive Committee of five, who shall constitute a board of Managers, and shall be chosen annually by a majority of members present.

Art. 5. The President shall preside at all meetings, or in his absence one of the Vice Presidents. The Treasurer shall hold all funds subject to the control of the Executive Committee, and give a statement of the same annually. The Recording Secretary shall keep the records of the Society and make an Annual Report. The Corresponding Secretary shall conduct the correspondence of the Society, subject to the advice and instruction of the official members.

Art. 6. The Board of Managers shall appoint agents to visit the different towns in this State, and address the people on the subject of Temperance, form societies auxiliary to the State Society, and collect funds to defray the expenses of agents, and in aid of the objects of this Society; and shall make their returns in time to accompany the Annual Report of the Secretary.

Art. 7. This Constitution may be altered or amended at any regular meeting of the Society, provided two thirds of the members agree to such alteration or amendment.

The following officers were chosen for the ensuing year: Rev. J. C. BEMAN, of Middletown, President. HENRY FOSTER, of Hartford, 1st Vice President. JOSEPH B. GILBERT, of Middletown, Treasurer. A. G. BEMAN, of Hartford, Rec. Secretary. ISAAC CROSS, of Hartford, Cor. Secretary.

Executive Committee. GEORGE GARRISON, of Middletown. ALEXANDER C. LUCKY, of New Haven. WM. CONNOLLY, of Lyme. WM. RANDALL, of Hartford. P. SWAN, of Hartford.

Rev. J. C. Beman was appointed Agent of the Society, in conformity with Art. 6 of the Constitution.

P. OSBORN, Secretary.
June, 1836.

P. S. The following piece composed for the occasion by a colored young woman of Hartford—formerly a scholar at Miss Crandall's school, was sung at the Convention:

A temperance feast, a feast of joy,
Where willing hearts agree;
How good to mingle in the train,
An hour from sadness free!
We'll leave the table spread with wine,
And scorn the tangle's bowl.
For thence that tempts the creature man
A reasonable soul.
Instruction true, experience sore
Has taught us how to shun
The awful path that drunkard's take,
And down to ruin run.
May Heaven grant us wisdom now,
And aid in peace and love;
And guide us thro' the snares of life,
To blessedness above.

E. F.

CHAPLIN, Ct. June 6th, 1836.

Sir—By direction of the Anti-Slavery Society of Chaplin, Connecticut, I send you for publication, if you deem it expedient, our Constitution and declaration of principles.

DECLARATION OF PRINCIPLES.

1st. We regard slavery, as it exists in the United States, as morally wrong in itself considered, independently of the cruelties often connected with it.

2d. We consider it as wrong, inasmuch as it converts persons into things which may be bought and sold, thus making men mere property—changing God's image into merchandise.

3d. We consider it as wrong, inasmuch as it renders no equivalent for those inestimable birthright endowments, which have never been surrendered by volition, or forfeited by crime.

4th. We consider it as wrong, inasmuch as it invades the sanctity of those domestic relations, ordained by God; practically annihilates marriage; nullifies parental authority; favors and countenances licentiousness and crime.

5th. We consider it as wrong, inasmuch as it is directly at variance with the precepts of the Gospel and the spirit of Christianity.

6th. We consider that its tendency is directly calculated to reduce the laboring class of community to the same level with slaves, and that liberty and slavery cannot long co-exist in the same nation.

7th. We consider it an evil, great in magnitude, alarming in its consequences, whose influence pervades the body politic, and whose existence is a stain on our national character.

8th. Adopting the sentiment, that, morally, man can hold no property in man, we consider that slavery ought entirely and forever to cease; that the slaves should be brought under the jurisdiction of law—be protected in their right by its provisions, and be punished for their crimes by its enactments.

9th. We consider that all legislative enactments on the subject, in the several States, are wisely left to the legislatures of those States. We disclaim all right or intention of interfering with slavery in the slaveholding States, except moral influence. Still, we claim the right of freely examining the subject—of freely expressing our opinion upon it, and of freely using that moral influence we possess to remove it.

10th. We claim this, because we are citizens of a common country, possessing common interests. All subjects, therefore, having an influence on the general welfare of our country, are the legitimate subjects of investigation and inquiry for all her citizens; and the extension of a healthy, moral influence on all such subjects, is their inalienable right.

11th. We consider that we are directly implicated in the guilt of slavery, inasmuch as it is tolerated and protected by law in those territories and districts, under the exclusive jurisdiction of the Congress of the United States.

12th. To a correct public sentiment on this subject, we look for the extinction of slavery, and the removal of this crying evil from our land.

13th. This sentiment we shall endeavor to form, by all proper and appropriate means in our power, by diffusing information, by petitioning Congress, or by any other measures calculated to produce the desired effect.

14th. To this duty, we believe the best interest of the slaveholders themselves urge us. We are urged in it by the voice of two millions and a half of our fellow men, held in servitude. We are urged to it by the welfare of our common country, by the voice of bleeding humanity, by the requirements of Almighty God.

CONSTITUTION.

Art. 1. This Society shall be called the Chaplin Anti-Slavery Society, and shall be composed of all persons acknowledging the foregoing principles, and signing this Constitution.

Art. 2. Believing that holding men in involuntary servitude, deeming them as property, denying them the light of science and revelation, as contrary to the spirit of the Gospel, diametrically opposed to the principles of our free institutions, and ought to cease. To produce the utter extinction of slavery in the United States, we will use the influence we possess in such a manner as becomes peaceable and good citizens.

Art. 3. The object of this Society shall be, to acquire and diffuse information on the subject of slavery, to promote a correct public sentiment on the subject, and take such measures as shall tend to produce the peaceable extinction of the evil from our land.

Art. 4. The officers of this Society shall be a President, two Vice Presidents, a Corresponding Secretary, a Recording Secretary, and three Managers, all constituting an Executive Committee, who shall perform the duties usually devolving on such officers.

Art. 5. This Constitution may be altered by a vote of two thirds of the members present, at any regular meeting of the Society.

At a meeting of the Chaplin Anti-Slavery Society, June 4th, 1836, the foregoing Constitution was adopted.

Officers of the Society.

JOHN ROSS, Esq. President.
LUTHER BURNHAM, Vice President.
DEA. DARIUS KNIGHT, Vice President.
DEA. JARED CLARK, Cor. Secretary.
JOSEPH C. MARTIN, Rec. Secretary.
JOHN ELIAS SHAFER, Manager.
EZEKIEL KINGSBURY, Manager.
JOHN J. BERNHAM, Manager.

Per order of the Society,
JARED CLARK, Secretary.

SLAVE LABOR PRODUCTIONS.

Extract of a letter from a highly intelligent female Friend, dated

PHILADELPHIA, 6th mo. 26, 1836.

I notice in the last number of the Liberator, a letter from Wm. Jay, reviewing, in severe style, the resolution adopted by the American A. S. Society, on the motion of Gerrit Smith, relative to the use of slave labor productions; which resolution appears to me to be in strict accordance with the principles and objects of that society, as set forth at the time of its formation, in the faul Declaration, thus: 'We shall encourage the labor of free men rather than that of slaves, by giving a preference to their productions.' Now, although this does not embrace so much as the language of the resolution, yet it cannot be viewed as altogether apart from it;—and if we are not prepared, three years after such a Declaration, to carry out so just a principle, and see ourselves in our true light, as 'partners of other men's sins,' while we are willing participants in the fruit of their iniquities, we need scarcely expect to bring to conviction our agents 'at the south'—while we put it in their power to retort upon us the taunting enquiry, 'Thou that sayest, a man should not steal, dost thou steal?'

Please refer friend Jay to the constitution of a number of the Anti-Slavery Societies, as published in the Liberator, one important article of which is abstention from slave productions.—Farmingington, I think, binds the obligation on its members. These are auxiliary to the American Society;—and surely in a meeting of this society, such a resolution as that proposed by Gerrit Smith, and which some of us are urged to see, cannot, with propriety, be regarded as irrelevant as 'in a Bible Society, an election for a political candidate,' or in a Temperance Society, an exertion of influence for or against infant baptism.

If that body associated for the diffusion of such sentiments as would most speedily abolish slavery, and, on examination, we are found to be so deeply implicated in the crime, that in judging of others, we are forced to condemn also ourselves, may we not at least recommend the subject to our further examination, and seek Divine guidance?

If this lead us to 'hint' at sinful practices among ourselves, and 'insinuate' without 'rebuking the sinner,' we ought surely to be willing to receive and apply such hints, without fear of 'wounding one another in the armor of conflict,' when in the same spirit of love 'we send forth agents to lift up the voice of remonstrance, of warning, of entreaty, and of rebuke' to the slaveholder.

Excuse me if I say, the further reasoning of Wm. Jay is unworthy so sound a lawyer, and his conclusions ill befit so wise a judge.

May we all cultivate a disposition that will lead us to be willing to be 'withstood to the face' when we 'are to be blamed.'

* See Haynes' Speech in reply to Webster, on the Tariff question, some years since.

† To societies, expressly so constituted, Judge Jay makes no opposition.—Ed. Lib.

Is the intellect of the colored equal to the intellect of the white man? Or the weak confounding the mighty.

DEAR BROTHER:—Let the following fact, which recently took place in the town of Alton, Illinois, answer this question. A project was started to build a splendid and convenient Hotel in that town. The building committee issued proposals for the best plan, and offered one share as a reward to the successful competitor—the plans to be sent in without the names of the architects.

A colored man, seeing an opportunity thus offered of testing the comparative strength of intellect and genius in the colored and white man, went to work, devised and presented a plan among many others.—The committee met, and having carefully examined all the plans, selected the one presented by the colored man—not knowing, of course, by whom it was presented. It may well be imagined there was much excitement, much anxiety among the committee, the inhabitants and the mechanics, to know who presented the favored plan. The mechanics all came forward, and one after another had to confess themselves

